

INITIAL STUDY

1. **PROJECT FILE NUMBER:** PDC01-060
2. **PROJECT TITLE:** The Lofts at The Alameda/Morrison
3. **PROJECT LOCATION:** Northeasterly corner of The Alameda and Morrison Avenue
4. **GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** General Commercial; Neighborhood Business District.
5. **ZONING:** Existing: CG Commercial General and CO Office; Proposed: A(PD) Planned Development
6. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Planned Development Rezoning from CG and CO to A(PD) Planned Development District and subsequent permits and subdivision to allow existing office uses and up to 40 loft and live work residential units with structured parking on 0.99 gross acres.
7. **SURROUNDING USES:** North: Single-family Residential; South: Commercial and Community Center; East: Commercial and Single-family Residential; West: Vacant Commercial
8. **PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS:** Marianne Bacigalupi, Green Valley Corporation, 777 North First Street, 5th Floor, San Jose, CA 95112

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared
X	I find that although construction of the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because project conditions have been agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potential significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has already adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION , including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, a "USE OF EIR" or "USE OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION" certification will be used for this project, and no further environmental analysis is required.

Carol Hamilton

Date

CONTACT PERSON & PHONE NUMBER: Carol Hamilton, City of San Jose, (408) 277-4576.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated in the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources	x	Air Quality
	Biological Resources	x	Cultural / Historic Resources		Geology / Soils
	Hazards / Hazardous Materials	x	Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	x	Noise/Vibration		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation / Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------------

I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
e) Increase the amount of shade in public and private open space on adjacent sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2

DISCUSSION: The project proposes construction of 40 single-family attached live-work and loft residential units in two, four-story buildings with a maximum height of 49 feet and structured parking on 0.99 gross acres. The site is currently developed with an existing office building that is proposed to remain.

The site is located within The Alameda Neighborhood Business District and is surrounded by urban development. The architecture of the proposed buildings reflects elements of traditional architecture from the surrounding area. The design has been reviewed with interested residents of the surrounding neighborhood and has been modified to respond to neighborhood comment. The residential structures are set back from the adjacent single family residence in conformance with the Residential Design Guidelines. The design of the 15-foot tall garage structure has been coordinated extensively with residents of the three adjacent single-family lots. The garage will result in increases in shadows on the rear yard of one of the lots, but the change is very slight and will not significantly impact the usage of this rear yard area.

The proposed project provides live/work units fronting on The Alameda in support of the Neighborhood Business District. The project has been found to be consistent with the General Commercial General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation of the site based on the Two Acre Rule. Landscaping, including street trees will be provided to soften, and enhance the site and its structures. Outdoor lighting fixtures will be full cut-off, low pressure sodium fixtures in conformance with the City's Outdoor Lighting Policy. Lighting fixtures will be set back

from adjacent residential property lines or will be fully shielded to prevent light from spilling over onto adjacent properties.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4

DISCUSSION: The project site is 0.99 acres in size and has been developed with urban uses for at least the past 75 years. The site is too small for viable agricultural use and the proposed development will not result in the loss of prime soils.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required.

II. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,14
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X		<input type="checkbox"/>	1,14
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,14
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,14
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,14

DISCUSSION: The proposed 40 unit residential project will not create significant adverse impacts on air quality or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. This proposed infill development supports the Growth Management Strategy of the San Jose 2020 General Plan by providing more intense, pedestrian oriented live/work development proximate to transit facilities and commercial services. The San Jose 2020 General Plan EIR recognizes and addresses cumulative air quality impacts resulting from buildout consistent with the San Jose 2020 Land Use/Transportation Diagram. The project has the potential to result in temporary impacts from dust generated during construction activities that would contribute to regional air quality.

MITIGATION MEASURES: Prudent precautions will be taken during construction activities. While the project is under construction, the developer shall implement effective dust control measures to prevent dust and other airborne matter from leaving the site. The BAAQMD has prepared a list of feasible construction dust control measures that can reduce construction impacts to a level that is less than significant. The following construction practices will be implemented during all phases of construction on the project site. With the inclusion of these mitigation measures, the short-term air quality impacts associate with construction will be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

- Use dust-proof chutes for loading construction debris onto trucks
- Water to control dust generation during demolition of structures and break-up of pavement
- Cover all trucks hauling demolition debris from the site

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------	------------------------

- Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, or other materials that can be blown by the wind
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, or other loose materials, or require trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard
- Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access road, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites
- Sweep streets daily with water sweepers or as often as necessary to keep them free of visible dirt and debris.
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.)
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible

III. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,10
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,6,10
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,6
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,10
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,11
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

DISCUSSION: No rare, threatened, endangered or special status species of flora or fauna are known to inhabit the site. The 0.99 -acre project site is surrounded by urban development. The site is currently developed with two single-family residences and an existing office building which is proposed to remain.

Two ordinance-size trees on the site (a palm, 125.6 inches in diameter and a redwood, 53 inches in diameter) are proposed for removal as result of the project development. The removal of these trees is not expected to result in a significant impact relative to biological resources. Substantial replacement vegetation will be required as a condition of the proposed development, including a minimum of eight, 24-inch box specimen trees to replace the ordinance-size trees proposed for removal. MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,7, 24
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,8, 24
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,8, 24
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,8, 24

DISCUSSION: Two existing single-family structures on the project site were built c.1925 (80 North Morrison) and 1917 (935 The Alameda). A Special Use Permit was approved by the Director of Planning to allow the removal of these structures on July 12, 2002 (File No. SP 02-027). Subsequent to approval of the Special Use Permit, the applicant decided to delay demolition until the after approval of the proposed development. An historic report prepared for the site by Archaeological Resource Management on May 23, 2002, entitled "Historical Structures Evaluation of the Lofts at Morrison Project in the City of San Jose" indicated that neither structure is listed or eligible for listing on the National Register, the California Register or on the City of San Jose Historic Resources Inventory. The report further concluded that the structures are not associated with any known historical figure, are not unusual or fine examples of a particular architectural style, and are not significant historic resources requiring mitigation. The report indicated that some architectural elements of the two structures could be salvaged for reuse. A condition was included in the Special Use Permit requiring the property owner to offer the structures to preservation organizations and the public for salvage prior to demolition. This condition will be included in the future Planned Development Permit for this site.

The site is located in an area of archaeological sensitivity. Staff has reviewed the archaeological report prepared for the site by Archaeological Resource Management, dated October 10, 2001, entitled "Cultural Resource Evaluation for the Lofts at Morrison Project in the City of San Jose." The report concludes that no archaeological sites are recorded on the property, that the surface reconnaissance revealed no traces of prehistoric resources and that monitoring for prehistoric resources is not necessary. The report recommends monitoring of demolition and construction activities by a qualified archaeologist due to the potential for historic subsurface resources to exist on the site.

MITIGATION MEASURES: There shall be monitoring of site excavation activities to the extent determined by a qualified professional archaeologist to be necessary to insure accurate evaluation of potential impacts to prehistoric resources.

- 1) If no resources are discovered, the archaeologist shall submit a report to the Director of Planning verifying that the required monitoring occurred and that no further mitigation is necessary.
- 2) If evidence of any archaeological, cultural, and/or historical deposits are found, hand excavation and/or mechanical excavation will proceed to evaluate the deposits for determination of significance as defined by CEQA guidelines. The archaeologist shall submit reports, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, describing the testing program and subsequent results. These reports shall identify any program mitigation that the Developer shall complete in order to mitigate archaeological impacts (including resource recovery and/or avoidance testing and analysis, removal, reburial, and curation of archaeological resources.)

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------	------------------------

- 3) In the event that human remains and/or cultural materials are found, all project-related construction shall cease within a 50-foot radius in order to proceed with the testing and mitigation measures required. Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California:
- a) In the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The Santa Clara County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the land owner shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.
 - b) A final report shall be submitted to the Director of Planning prior to release of a Certificate of Occupancy. This report shall contain a description of the mitigation programs and its results including a description of the monitoring and testing program, a list of the resources found, a summary of the resources analysis methodology and conclusions, and a description of the disposition/curation of the resources. The report shall verify completion of the mitigation program to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

IV. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5

DISCUSSION: The project site is not located on a known fault, or in an area susceptible to landslides, nor is it identified for potential strong ground shaking or a designated City of San Jose Geologic Zone. The closest known

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------------

fault is the Quimby Fault located approximately 15 miles to the east of the site. As is typical with the entire Bay Area the project site is in a general area of potential geological sensitivity. All potential geologic problems will be mitigated with standard engineering techniques.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

V. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	1
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,12
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

DISCUSSION: No information was found indicating that significant quantities of hazardous materials have historically been used or stored at the site. The site has been developed with residential and commercial uses for at least 75 years.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None proposed.

VI. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,15
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------------

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,17
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,9
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,9
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
j) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

DISCUSSION: This proposed infill project on a previously developed site will not have a substantial adverse impact on, degrade water quality or alter existing drainage patterns. The site is not located within a designated 100-year floodplain; however, the increased impervious surface resulting from the project may affect the on-site drainage or increase the existing amount of runoff from the site.

MITIGATION: The project will incorporate mitigation measures to minimize urban run-off. The mitigation measures include a storm water run-off management plan for construction activities to satisfaction of Department of Public Works, and compliance with all applicable City, Local, Regional, State and Federal laws. The project shall conform to the City of San Jose National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Permit and shall include Best Management Practices (BMPs) as specified in the *Blueprint for a Clean Bay* to control the discharge of storm water pollutants including sediments associated with construction activities. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant may be required to submit an Erosion Control Plan to the City project Engineer. The Erosion Control Plan may include BMPs as specified by the Association of Bay Area Governments' Manual of Standards Erosion & Sediment Control Measures for reducing impacts on the City's storm drainage system from construction activities. For additional information about the Erosion Control Plan, the NPDES permit requirements, or the documents mentioned above, please call the Department of Public Works at (408) 277-5161.

VII. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

DISCUSSION: The project is consistent with the Neighborhood Business District designation of the site and is consistent with the General Commercial designation based on the General Plan Alternate Use Policy Two Acre Rule which allows residential uses on commercially designated properties of less than two acres with a Planned Development Zoning if the project is compatible with surrounding uses and exceeds the relevant development standards.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------------

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,23
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,23

DISCUSSION: The project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

XI. NOISE AND VIBRATION- Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X		<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,18,13,25
b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X		1
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

DISCUSSION: A noise and vibration report by Charles M. Salter Associates Inc., dated September 20, 2001, prepared for the subject site indicates that the site is exposed to noise from aircraft and to traffic noise from The Alameda and Morrison Avenue. The report indicates that the site is subject to aircraft noise levels of 65 to 68 dBA Leq. Twenty-four hour noise measurements at the site, adjusted to account for future increases in traffic, indicate future noise levels of 74 dBA DNL at The Alameda building façade and 67.5 dBA DNL at the most-impacted façade on Morrison Avenue.

The City of San Jose Noise Element specifies an exterior limit of 60 dB DNL for residential land use impacted by transportation related noise sources; however, the Noise Element also states that development in the vicinity of airports and along major roadways are exposed to noise levels that may not be able to meet this noise standard. The subject site is such a site.

The report indicates that project interior noise exposures are expected to exceed the 45 dB DNL interior noise guideline of the City of San Jose Noise Element and of Title 24 for those units facing The Alameda and Morrison Avenue, and that sound rated windows and doors will be required.

A supplemental noise analysis entitled "The Lofts at Morrison Parking Garage Noise Assessment" prepared by Charles M. Salter Associates Inc. assesses the potential noise impacts of the parking garage on the adjacent residences. The existing noise level at the residential property line is Ldn 62. The report indicates that the vehicle circulation associated with the garage would increase the ambient noise levels by up to 2 dBA, but that this noise increase would

Issues	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
--------	---	---	---	----------------------	--------------------------------

be offset by the fact that the garage will shield the residential site from noise from traffic on Morrison Street, resulting in no significant change in long-term average noise levels.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

To achieve interior noise exposures for compliance with 45 dB DNL standards, sound rated windows and doors will be required as follows:

- For units with facades facing The Alameda, windows with an STC rating of 41 are required and doors with an STC rating of 32 are required. The interior side of the wall within which windows are installed must be constructed of two layers of gypsum board on resilient channels.
- For units with facades facing Morrison Avenue, windows with an STC rating of 34 are required and doors with an STC rating of 26 are required.

Approval of this project will include a standard condition that any construction within 500 feet of a residential property shall be limited to 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

DISCUSSION: The project is proposed on a vacant infill site and is consistent with the site's General Plan land use designation. The project will not induce substantial population growth or require the extension of new roads or infrastructure. Development of the underutilized site will provide housing for an anticipated 114 residents. No people will be displaced as a result of the project.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

DISCUSSION: The project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts to public services and facilities. As discussed above, the 40-unit live-work/loft is consistent with the site's General Plan Land Use designation.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------	------------------------

Development of this infill site supports the Growth Management Strategy of the General Plan to encourage infill development on underutilized parcels where services and facilities are in place and Housing Goals to provide a variety of housing types for all segments of the community. Potential service level impacts to public facilities under the General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram were addressed by the San Jose 2020 General Plan EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required.

XIV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

DISCUSSION: The 40-unit project is anticipated to generate a population of approximately 114 residents. The project will not result in a significant increase in the use of existing neighborhood parks. The project proposes to conform to the City's Parkland Dedication Ordinance through the payment of fees which will be used by the City to provide new park facilities or to enhance existing facilities.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required

XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio of roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,19
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,19
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,19
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,19
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,20
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,18
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,18

DISCUSSION: This 40-unit residential project has been found to be in conformance with the City's Transportation Level of Service Policy and will not result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips in relation to the existing load capacity of the traffic system. The project will not result in an increase in safety hazards or result in inadequate emergency access. Parking for the project will be provided in conformance with the specifications of the Residential Design Guidelines.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,15
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,21
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,17
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,22
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,21
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,21
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,21

DISCUSSION: The proposed project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements, require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or result in construction of new stormwater facilities. The project will be served by existing solid waste facilities and will be in compliance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations related to solid waste. As indicated on the General Development Plan the project shall conform to Chapter 15.2 of the San Jose Municipal Code, Water Pollution Control Plan.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to (1) degrade the quality of the environment, (2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, (3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, (4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, (5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or (6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,10
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects and the effects of other current projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	1,16
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

DISCUSSION: This infill development is consistent with the site's General Plan designation and with General Plan policies to encourage infill development on underutilized parcels where services and facilities are already in place. Cumulative impacts of development of infill sites were addressed in the San Jose 2020 Environmental Impact Report.

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:

Air Quality

Issues	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
--------	---	---	---	----------------------	--------------------------------

The project will not conflict with the thresholds of significance for the local and regional air quality established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. However, there will be temporary impacts from the dust generated during construction activities. Construction will cause dust emissions that could have a significant temporary impact on local air quality and contribute sources to regional air quality.

Cultural Resources

The site is located in an area of archaeological sensitivity. Staff has reviewed the archaeological report prepared for the site by Archaeological Resource Management, dated October 10, 2001, entitled “Cultural Resource Evaluation for the Lofts at Morrison Project in the City of San Jose.” The report concludes that no archaeological sites are recorded on the property, that the surface reconnaissance revealed no traces of prehistoric resources and that monitoring for prehistoric resources is not necessary. The report recommends monitoring of demolition and construction activities by a qualified archaeologist due to the potential for historic subsurface resources to exist on the site.

Water Quality

The proposed project is a small infill project and will not have a substantial adverse impact on, degrade water quality or alter existing drainage patterns. The site is not located within a designated 100-year floodplain. However, the increased amount of on-site impervious surface resulting from the project may affect the on-site drainage or increase the existing amount of runoff from the site.

Noise

A noise and vibration report by Charles M. Salter Associates Inc., dated September 20, 2001, prepared for the subject site indicates that the site is exposed to noise from aircraft and to traffic noise from The Alameda and Morrison Avenue. The report indicates that the site is subject to aircraft noise levels of 65 to 68 dBA Leq. Twenty-four hour noise measurements at the site, adjusted to account for future increases in traffic, indicate future noise levels of 74 dBA DNL at The Alameda building façade and 67.5 dBA DNL at the most-impacted façade on Morrison Avenue. The City of San Jose Noise Element specifies an exterior limit of 60 dB DNL for residential land use impacted by transportation related noise sources; however, the Noise Element also states that development in the vicinity of airports and along major roadways are exposed to noise levels that may not be able to meet this noise standard. The subject site is such a site. The report indicates that project interior noise exposures are expected to exceed the 45 dB DNL interior noise guideline of the City of San Jose Noise Element and of Title 24 for those units facing The Alameda and Morrison Avenue, and that sound rated windows and doors will be required.

A supplemental noise analysis entitled “The Lofts at Morrison Parking Garage Noise Assessment” prepared by Charles M. Salter Associates Inc. assesses the potential noise impacts of the parking garage on the adjacent residences. The existing noise level at the residential property line is Ldn 62. The report indicates that the vehicle circulation associated with the garage would increase the ambient noise levels by up to 2 dBA but that this noise increase would be offset by the fact that the garage will shield the residential site from noise from traffic on Morrison Street, resulting in no significant change in long-term average noise levels.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Air Quality

Issues	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
--------	---	---	---	----------------------	--------------------------------

Prudent precautions should be taken during construction activities. While the project is under construction, the developer shall implement effective dust control measures to prevent dust and other airborne matter from leaving the site. The BAAQMD has prepared a list of feasible construction dust control measures that can reduce construction impacts to a level that is less than significant (see discussion in “Air Quality” section, above). These construction practices should be implemented during all phases of construction on the project site. With the inclusion of these mitigation measures, the short-term air quality impacts associate with construction will be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

- Use dust-proof chutes for loading construction debris onto trucks
- Water to control dust generation during demolition of structures and break-up of pavement
- Cover all trucks hauling demolition debris from the site
- Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, or other materials that can be blown by the wind
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, or other loose materials, or require trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard
- Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access road, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites
- Sweep streets daily with water sweepers or as often as necessary to keep them free of visible dirt and debris.
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.)
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible

Cultural Resources

There shall be monitoring of site excavation activities to the extent determined by a qualified professional archaeologist to be necessary to insure accurate evaluation of potential impacts to prehistoric resources.

- 4) If no resources are discovered, the archaeologist shall submit a report to the Director of Planning verifying that the required monitoring occurred and that no further mitigation is necessary.
- 5) If evidence of any archaeological, cultural, and/or historical deposits are found, hand excavation and/or mechanical excavation will proceed to evaluate the deposits for determination of significance as defined by CEQA guidelines. The archaeologist shall submit reports, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, describing the testing program and subsequent results. These reports shall identify any program mitigation that the Developer shall complete in order to mitigate archaeological impacts (including resource recovery and/or avoidance testing and analysis, removal, reburial, and curation of archaeological resources.)
- 6) In the event that human remains and/or cultural materials are found, all project-related construction shall cease within a 50-foot radius in order to proceed with the testing and mitigation measures required. Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California:
 - b) In the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------------

remains. The Santa Clara County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the land owner shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

- b) A final report shall be submitted to the Director of Planning prior to release of a Certificate of Occupancy. This report shall contain a description of the mitigation programs and its results including a description of the monitoring and testing program, a list of the resources found, a summary of the resources analysis methodology and conclusions, and a description of the disposition/curation of the resources. The report shall verify completion of the mitigation program to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

Water Quality

The project will incorporate mitigation measures to minimize urban run-off. The mitigation measures include a storm water run-off management plan for construction activities to satisfaction of Department of Public Works, and compliance with all applicable City, Local, Regional, State and Federal laws. The project shall conform to the City of San Jose National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Permit and shall include Best Management Practices (BMPs) as specified in the *Blueprint for a Clean Bay* to control the discharge of storm water pollutants including sediments associated with construction activities. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant may be required to submit an Erosion Control Plan to the City project Engineer. The Erosion Control Plan may include BMPs as specified by the Association of Bay Area Governments' Manual of Standards Erosion & Sediment Control Measures for reducing impacts on the City's storm drainage system from construction activities. For additional information about the Erosion Control Plan, the NPDES permit requirements, or the documents mentioned above, please call the Department of Public Works at (408) 277-5161.

Noise

To achieve interior noise exposures for compliance with 45 dB DNL standards, sound rated windows and doors will be required as follows:

- For units with facades facing The Alameda, windows with an STC rating of 41 are required and doors with an STC rating of 32 are required. The interior side of the wall within which windows are installed must be constructed of two layers of gypsum board on resilient channels.
- For units with facades facing Morrison Avenue, windows with an STC rating of 34 are required and doors with an STC rating of 26 are required.

Approval of this project will include a standard condition that any construction within 500 feet of a residential property shall be limited to 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday.

EARLIER ANALYSIS

1. Earlier Analysis Used: Historic report prepared for File No. SP02-027 by Archaeological Resource Management on May 23, 2002, entitled "Historical Structures Evaluation of the Lofts at Morrison Project in the City of San Jose"
2. Impacts Adequately Addressed: Yes

Issues	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
--------	---	---	---	----------------------	--------------------------------

3. Mitigation Measures: As indicated

CHECKLIST REFERENCES

1. Environmental Clearance Application – File No. PDC01-060
2. San Jose 2020 General Plan
3. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of SC County, August 1968
4. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Important Farmlands of SC County map, June 1979
5. State of California's Geo-Hazard maps / Alquist Priolo Fault maps
6. Riparian Corridor Policy Study 1994
7. San Jose Historic Resources Inventory
8. City of San Jose Archeological Sensitivity Maps
9. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Santa Clara County, 1986
10. California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, 2001
11. City of San Jose Heritage Tree Survey Report
12. California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, 1998
13. City of San Jose Noise Exposure Map for the 2020 General Plan
14. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. April 1996, revised 1999.
15. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board 1995 Basin Plan
16. Final Environmental Impact Report, City of San Jose, SJ 2020 General Plan
17. Santa Clara Valley Water District
18. City of San Jose Title 20 Zoning Ordinance
19. San Jose Department of Public Works
20. San Jose Fire Department
21. San Jose Environmental Services Department
22. San Jose Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company
23. California Division of Mines and Geology
24. Archaeological Resource Management report dated October 10, 2001 entitled "Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Lofts at Morrison Project in the City of San Jose."
25. Noise Report prepared by Charles M. Salter Associates Inc. dated September 20, 2001 and supplemental report entitled "The Lofts at Morrison Parking Garage Noise Assessment", dated November 12, 2002.

c.c. Lawrence DeSantis, Barry Swenson Builders, 777 North First Street, 5th Floor, San Jose, CA 95112